

Remarks

Claims 27, 36, 92-95, 103, 110, 111, 122, 123-124, 126-137 are pending in the instant application. Claims 27, 36, 92-95, 103, 110, 111, 122 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 123-124, 126-137 are under examination.

Objections

Claims 132-133 are objected under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 132 and 133 have been amended to depend from Claim 131 and to recite “agglomerated powder medium is reconstituted with water” for clarity. Hence this objection should be withdrawn.

Rejections

35 U.S.C. §112- Written Description

Claims 123, 124, 126-137 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to remove reference to protein-free media from the pending claims and therefore this rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112- Indefiniteness

Claims 134 and 136 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 134 has been amended to recite “the pH of said reconstituted mammalian medium is between 6 – 8”, support for which is found in the specification. Further, Claim 136 now depends from claim 135 for clarity.

Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)- Anticipation

Claims 132-133 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamilton *et al.* (Office Action, page 6).

Independent claim 123 and dependents thereof are directed to an agglomerated mammalian cell culture medium powder which exhibits reduced dusting and a larger particle size than does the non-agglomerated, dry mammalian medium powder from which it was prepared.

Hamilton's medium is not a dry powder medium, nor is it an agglomerated powder. Hamilton teaches a liquid MCDB medium (see Hamilton, Table 1: component concentrations are expressed in mg/L).

Therefore Hamilton does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, as described in Claims 132-133. Therefore, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete Reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daphne Reddy/

Registration No. 53,507
Daphne Reddy
Agent for Applicants
760-268-8397

Date: March 15, 2011